

I. REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are submitted in response to the Office Action of March 21, 2008 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 10 to emphasize certain aspects of Applicant's embodiments. The amendments are supported throughout the Substitute Specification that is being submitted herewith. No new matter has been introduced by virtue of the amendments.

In paragraph 2 at page 2 of the Office Action, the Disclosure was objected to because the electronic version of the specification had many typographical errors. A new substitute specification, correcting as many errors as Applicant could find, is being submitted herewith.

In paragraph 3 at page 2 of the Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to overcome this rejection.

In paragraph 7 at page 3 of the Office Action, Claims 1, 4-8, 11, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,133,810 to Butler (hereinafter 'Butler') in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,184,844 to Filipovic et al. (hereinafter Filipovic).

In paragraph 9 at page 4 of the Office Action, Claims 2, 9 and 10 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In paragraph 10 at page 4 of the Office Action, Claims 12, 16 and 17 were allowed.

II. Applicant's Invention

Before further discussion on the cited art, the Applicant wants to remind the Examiner of the claimed embodiments as amended herein. As a representative claim, claim 1 recites an antenna structure comprised of a multifilar helix antenna etched on a flexible substrate and substantially parallel and substantially concentric metallic rings fixed or positioned around the longitudinal axis of the helix antenna and along at least one of a total length or a partial length of

the helix antenna where the substantially concentric metallic rings are parasitically coupled to the multifilar helix antenna.

III. The Claims Define Over the Prior Art

Claims 1, 4-8, 11, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Butler in view of Filipovic. The Examiner introduces Filipovic for the teaching of a flexible substrate with rings. As previously noted, Filipovic does not have parasitically coupled rings. Filipovic teaches away from parasitically coupled rings and teaches rings that short the helices of helical antenna. Moreover, the ring 412 of Filipovic is part of the **ground plane**. See Column 13, lines 13 and 47 of Filipovic. A ground plane 412 is NOT a parasitic entity as recited in the Applicant's claimed embodiments. If one were to remove the ring/ground plane 412 in Filipovic, the antenna would simply not work and would not be even considered a quadrifilar or multifilar antenna! If one were to remove the parasitically coupled ring in the Applicant's embodiment, the antenna would still work.

Butler is introduced as teaching a helix antenna and two helical parasites, but the Applicant fails to see anything that remotely resembles concentric rings in Butler. In any event, Applicant has incorporated a substantial portion of the language found in claim 2, which the Examiner indicated would be allowable if rewritten in independent form that further overcomes the section 112 rejection.

Thus, Applicant respectfully believes, the claims as currently recited are novel and non-obvious over Filipovic, Butler or any other art previously cited by the Examiner.

IV. CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that this application is now in full condition for allowance. Allowance is therefore respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 10, 2008

/Pablo Meles/
Pablo Meles, Registration No. 33,739
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
Customer No. 30448
P.O. Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Tel: 954-759-8959